



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/810,992	03/16/2001	William Philip Shaouy	RSW920010028US1	7307

7590 10/27/2003

IBM CORPORATION
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY LAW DEPT. IQOA/BLDG. 040-3
1701 NORTH STREET
ENDICOTT,, NY 13760

EXAMINER

ARSHAD, UMAR

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2174

DATE MAILED: 10/27/2003

5

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

pre

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/810,992	Applicant(s) SHAOUY ET AL.	
	Examiner Umar Arshad	Art Unit 2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/16/2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-11 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) <u>5</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Specification

Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because it uses implied phrases and repeats information given in the title (see above). Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).

The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: the drawing reference "315" on figure 3 is incorrectly associated with the object "arbiter" on page 6, line 12; the drawing reference "345" on figure 3 is incorrectly associated with the object "content database proxy" on page 7, line 4.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 4 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a punctuation error on line 1; a comma is incorrectly placed after the word "claim".
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 6 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a grammatical error on line 6; the word "the" is incorrectly placed after the word "object".
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 8 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a grammatical error on line 7; the word "the" is incorrectly placed after the word "selects".
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim 9 is objected to because of the following informalities: there is a grammatical error on line 1; the word "the" is incorrectly placed after the word "passing".
Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1,2,4,6,8, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Kadowaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,313,921.

As per claim 1, Kadowaki teaches a method for tailoring information to characteristics of a information user, comprising the acts of:

a) passing a request object containing at least one profile element to an arbiter (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 38 – 61; the examiner interprets the printer controller as an arbiter because it directs personalization information to a personalization server);

b) selecting a personalization engine from a plurality of personalization engines by the arbiter (see Kadowaki, column 15, lines 41 – 45);

c) accessing a content database to retrieve a personalized content object identified by the personalization engine selected by the arbiter (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 63 – 67 and column 19, line 1; it is inherent that the personalization server must store and manage the personalizing information in a database if it is to extract said information for a particular user).

As per claim 2, which is dependent on claim 1, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kadowaki further teaches the method comprising the act of passing the personalized content object to an application program (see Kadowaki, column 19, lines 1 – 3).

As per claim 4, which is dependent on claim 1, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kadowaki further teaches the method comprising the act of sending the request object over a communication network (see Kadowaki, column 2, lines 25 – 30).

As per claim 6, which is dependent on claim 1, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kadowaki further teaches the method comprising the acts of:

d) accessing a profile database that stores profile elements associated with the request object (see Kadowaki, column 19, 51 – 67; it is inherent that the personalization information is stored in a database);

e) retrieving from the profile database at least one profile element associated with the request object (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 63 – 67 and column 19, lines 1 – 11); and

f) including in the request object at least one profile element retrieved from the profile database (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 38 – 67 and column 19, lines 1 – 11; it is inherent that the user ID sent in the request object is part of the user profile retrieved by the personalization server).

As per claim 8, Kadowaki teaches an apparatus for tailoring information to characteristics of an information user, the apparatus comprising:

a) an arbiter for accepting and analyzing a request object (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 38 – 61; the examiner interprets the printer controller as an arbiter because it directs personalization information to a personalization server); and

b) a plurality of personalization engines for selecting at least one personalization object from a content database (see Kadowaki, column 15, lines 41 – 45);

wherein the arbiter selects a personalization engine from the plurality of personalization engines (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 38 – 44), and the selected personalization engine selects at least one personalization content from the content database (see Kadowaki, column 18, lines 62 – 67, and column 19, lines 1 – 11).

As per claim 9, which is dependent on claim 8, Kadowaki further teaches the apparatus comprising output logic for passing at least one personalization content object to an application program over a communication network (see Kadowaki column 2, lines 25 – 30 and column 19, lines 1 – 3; it is inherent that the printer controller is an application program)

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 3, 5, 10 and 11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadowaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,313,921 in view of Kurtzman, II, U.S. Patent No. 6,044,376.

As per claim 3, which is dependent on claim 2, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 2 (see rejection above). Kadowaki does not teach the method wherein the application program is a web browser. Kurtzman, II teaches the method wherein the application program is a web browser (see Kurtzman, II, column 3, lines 32 – 37, and column 3, lines 60 – 67; it is taught that the user communicates to the web server via a web browser, and it is inherent that when the personalized content is delivered to the user it is viewed via said web browser). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method taught by Kurtzman, II with the method taught by Kadowaki to provide a more sophisticated profiling technique for use in a web browser.

As per claim 5, which is dependent on claim 4, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 4 (see rejection above). Kadowaki does not teach the method wherein the communication network is the Internet. Kurtzman, II teaches the method wherein the communication network is the Internet (see Kurtzman, II, column 3, lines 32 – 37, and column 3, lines 60 – 67).

As per claim 10, which is dependent on claim 9, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Kadowaki does not teach the method wherein the communication network is the Internet. Kurtzman, II teaches the method wherein the communication network is the Internet (see Kurtzman, II, column 3, lines 32 – 37, and column 3, lines 60 – 67).

As per claim 11, which is dependent on claim 9, Kadowaki teaches the method of claim 9 (see rejection above). Kadowaki does not teach the method wherein the application program is a web browser. Kurtzman, II teaches the method wherein the application program is a web browser (see Kurtzman, II, column 3, lines 32 – 37, and column 3, lines 60 – 67; it is taught that the user communicates to the web server via a web browser, and it is inherent that when the personalized content is delivered to the user it is viewed via said web browser). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the method taught by Kurtzman, II with the method taught by Kadowaki to provide a more sophisticated profiling technique for use in a web browser.

Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kadowaki, U.S. Patent No. 6,313,921 in view of Jacobi et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,064,980 and Tetzlaff, U.S. Patent No. 6,556,963.

As per claim 7, which is dependent on claim 1, teach the method of claim 1 (see rejection above). Kadowaki does not teach the method wherein the plurality of personalization engines comprises at least two personalization engines selected from the group consisting of a rule-based personalization engine, a predictive-modeling personalization, and a collaborative filtering personalization.

Jacobi et al. teaches a collaborative filtering engine (see Jacobi et al., column 2, lines 18 – 21; the examiner interprets the recommendation service as a personalization engine because it uses collaborative filtering using particular user information to recommend items to users).

Tetzlaff teaches a rule-based personalization engine (see Tetzlaff, column 2, lines 22 – 27; the examiner interprets the feedback generator as a personalization engine because it uses rule-based protocol to give feedback to a user depending on a particular user model).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to incorporate the personalization engines as taught by Jacobi et al. and Tetzlaff with the method of Kadowaki in order to provide more options from which to select personalization from.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. Feng, U.S. Patent No. 6,483,523 teaches a personalized interface browser and its browsing method. Markus et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,490,601 teaches a server for enabling the automatic insertion of data into electronic forms on a user computer. Eylon et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,574,618 teaches a method and system for executing network streamed application.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Umar Arshad whose telephone number is (703) 305-0329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9am - 5:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-3900.

UA

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100